



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

desire of reading the New Testament was increased."*

We trust that the persecution of Ceccetti will have the effect of stirring up many of his countrymen to read and study the Word of God for themselves, notwithstanding all the obstacles and impediments which the agents of the Church of Rome may interpose. And we ought to return thanks to Almighty God, that He has been pleased to place us beyond the power of Romish inquisitors, and that we have been born in a free land, where we need not fear that we shall be cast into a felon's cell, if we venture, in the privacy of our chambers, to read and meditate on that blessed Book, which "is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus".—2 Tim. iii. 15.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND.

WHAT is toleration? The dictionary defines it to be an allowance given to that which is not approved. What, then, is religious toleration? An allowance given to the free and unconstrained exercise of a religion which those who have the power to prevent it do not approve. Our Roman Catholic brethren in England and Ireland, living under a Protestant Queen and Protestant constitution, which does not approve of their form of faith, but, on the contrary, solemnly protests against its errors in many important respects, and yet enjoying the free and unconstrained permission to exercise their religious worship as they please, have the largest and noblest exemplification of what is meant by religious toleration that, perhaps, the history of religion has ever afforded. Do we grudge them all this? Far from it; we rejoice at it and glory in it. We would persuade their understandings and convince their judgments by fair argument and sound reason; but we would never for a moment coerce or control their religious liberty.

But civil and religious liberty has been a party cry among politicians of a certain class, who style themselves liberals, and has been for thirty years a party toast among Roman Catholic agitators, at every political demonstration. The Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Cullen, at the Rotundo meeting in Dublin, some time since, stated that the Pope and the bishops (Roman Catholics) were the true friends of civil and religious liberty. But what do they mean by religious liberty? In a Protestant country, we know very well that they mean liberality to themselves—that liberty to exercise their own religion in Protestant countries freely which they deny to all other religions in Roman Catholic countries; elsewhere religious liberty means the liberty to oppress and banish all other professions of faith but their own. "But if he were lord in the land, and the Protestants in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? If it would benefit the cause of (Roman) Catholicism, he would tolerate you, if expedient he would imprison you, fine you, or, perhaps, banish you, (as the Pope did the respectable Roman Catholic priest, the Abbe Laborde, a few months ago); but be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the glorious principle of civil and religious liberty." These are not our sentiments, but the candid avowal of a widely-circulated Roman Catholic publication in England (*The Remembrancer*), expressed in the year 1851.

If the Roman Catholics of any parish in Ireland were anxious to build a chapel, and had collected the necessary funds, and had purchased an eligible site, but, after they had just laid the foundation, were prohibited by a Protestant Government from putting a single stone of the edifice upon another, would they not consider it a mockery and a mere humbug to say that this was religious liberty? And how would they be satisfied if they were told that as the English nation prohibits the burning of widows in India, so the Queen of England is in duty bound to hinder, if she can, the perpetual burning of the souls of her own people in hell? Yet this is the very apology given by the *Tablet* newspaper, for the Pope's preventing the erection of a Protestant Church in Rome; and this is what Dr. Cullen means by religious liberty when he says that the Pope is the friend of religious liberty; he means only in those cases in which liberty is to be received at the hands of the liberal and enlightened Protestants, to whom the slightest reciprocity or return is contemptuously denied. No better reason is vouchsafed for prohibiting their reading of the Bible in Tuscany, or the decent burial of Protestants in Lisbon or Madrid. In Italy, Naples, Spain, or Portugal, where the power of the Pope is dominant, the public exercise of their religion by Protestants is a crime. Compare with this, the condition of our Roman Catholic brethren in Ireland and England. Their reason is addressed when it can be approached; their attention is affectionately and respectfully invited to the hearing of truths from which they may forbear if they will; they are sometimes, we rejoice to say oftentimes, convinced, but never coerced. The only invasion of their religious liberty comes from their own priesthood and bishops who

employ menaces and terror, and sometimes physical force, to influence their religious conduct and profession. But so far as the Protestant government under which they live, and the Protestant ministers by whom they are surrounded, are concerned, they hear but the words of kindness and of protection, of counsel and encouragement.

We are not about to enter into the vexed politics of the day, or to meddle in any way with the recent discussions in Parliament or elsewhere relative to the Maynooth Endowment; but we ask any dispassionate Roman Catholic reader, does not the very existence of an endowment, in a Protestant state, of a seminary for the education of Roman Catholic priests, present the most extraordinary instance of religious toleration that even the history of Protestant England could produce? Those who struggle for its withdrawal complain—we do not say whether rightly or wrongly—that it passes beyond the fair limits of toleration, and amounts to an encouragement and patronage of what the Queen and the Parliament profess to be a schismatical creed, in the most substantial and unequivocal shape. We do not ask our readers to consider whether these people are justified in their complaints or not; such considerations as these are beyond the sphere of our inquiries, and we meddle not with them; but let them endeavour to realize the fact of an endowment of a Protestant seminary for Protestant clergymen, patronized and endowed by the Pope and cardinals in Rome, and when they have stretched their imagination to such a point as this, then, we believe, they can more temperately estimate the conduct of those Protestants, whether in England and Ireland, who are demanding the withdrawal of the endowment from the College of Maynooth by the Parliament of a Protestant country.

Liberty is one thing, liberality is another; but endowment is certainly step considerably in advance of either; and those who are willing to concede the fullest liberty to the exercise of a faith of which they cannot approve, and are disposed to act with the greatest liberality towards those who profess that faith, may, nevertheless, with perfect consistency (but whether wisely or not we do not now pretend to say), decline to bear the responsibility of its propagation, by the endowment of seminaries for the purpose of educating a priesthood in what they believe to be serious errors in doctrine and morals.

THE APOCRYPHA.

THE controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics respecting the Rule of Faith involves two principal questions—first, Is the Rule of Faith contained in the written Word alone, or must we join to it the unwritten Word (Tradition)? Secondly, What constitutes the written Word? Does it include the apocryphal Scriptures or not? Does the Protestant Bible contain the whole or only a part of it? In short, what is the canon of Scripture?

The Church of these realms agrees with the Church of Rome respecting the canon of the *New Testament*; not so, however, with respect to the *Old Testament*. We acknowledge those books only to be canonical which our blessed Lord and his inspired apostles stamped with their authority, and which the Christian Church, during a period of fifteen centuries, recognised as divine. Roman Catholic theologians admit that our Lord and his apostles sanctioned the Jewish canon (which excluded the Apocrypha); they allow, moreover, that the Apocrypha was not admitted into the Christian canon for the first three or four centuries; but they contend that, at that date, and in virtue of the developing power inherent in the Church, the apocryphal books were enrolled in the Christian canon, and thenceforward continued to be recognised as the canon of the Church; and that the Council of Trent merely declared what had been the immemorial doctrine of the Church upon the subject, when it pronounced the Apocrypha to be divinely-inspired Scripture, and anathematized all who should dare to deny it.

The proofs usually relied on by Roman Catholic writers of the reception of the Apocrypha as divine by the Church, from the fourth century onward, are the following:—1. The catalogue of canonical books given by Augustine at the end of the fourth century. 2. The decree of the Council of Carthage, also about the same date. 3. The decretal of Pope Innocent I., at the beginning of the fifth century. 4. The decretal of Pope Gelasius, at the close of the fifth century. 5. The decree of Pope Eugenius IV. in the "Instruction to the Armenians," drawn up after the close of the Council of Florence, about the middle of the fifteenth century (1439).

Now, without dwelling at present upon the insuperable objection to the canonicity of the Apocrypha, arising from its admitted non-reception as canonical during the first four centuries, and which fatal objection the ingenious fiction of gradual development in vain attempts to remove,—without, we say, enlarging on this now, we will address ourselves to the so-called proofs, by which it has been attempted to show that since the fourth century the Apocrypha has been acknowledged by the Church to be inspired. We have already shown (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., pp. 112, 125) that the authenticity of the documents enumerated above under the second, third, and fourth heads, is more than questionable, and, in fact, that the evidence of their spuriousness is so strong as to de-

prive them of any weight as proofs of the point under discussion. We have shown, with reference to the decree of the Council of Carthage, that it contains a gross anachronism of no less than twenty years. We have also shown that Pope Innocent's decretal, which purports to have been written at the opening of the fifth century, was first brought to light late in the ninth century—more than four centuries and a half after it professes to have been written. And, lastly, we have shown that the evidence on which Pope Gelasius's decree rests is, in the highest degree, precarious. But, even admitting the genuineness of these questionable documents, we are prepared to prove that they lend no countenance to the Tridentine decree respecting the Apocrypha. We commence, then, by making a very important distinction, upon which the whole question turns, and which, therefore, Roman Catholic controversialists endeavour, as much as possible, to keep out of sight and ignore. The distinction referred to is that between the restricted meaning which we now exclusively attach to the terms "canonical," "Scripture," "sacred Scripture," and the wider sense in which they were frequently used by the earlier writers. We moderns restrict their application to the *inspired* Scriptures exclusively, and this is the sense in which the terms are always understood in the controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics. But it was otherwise in times when controversy did not oblige men to use theological terms in a precise and definite sense: hence we occasionally find the term "canonical" applied by early writers, not merely to the inspired books of Scripture, but to one or more of the apocryphal books, not with the intention of placing them in the same category, as to divine authority, with the inspired books, but simply in order to express the fact that these apocryphal books were *read in the churches*, and were held in reverence, as containing rules (canones) for the practical guidance of life. The truth of this assertion we will establish presently, and especially we will adduce in support of it the express authority of one of the greatest of the Romish divines themselves—Cardinal Cajetan. Similarly, the earlier writers frequently quote the apocryphal books as "Scripture," and sometimes even as "divine Scripture"; but what they meant thereby was merely to distinguish the books *read in the churches*, and which, on that account, might, in a certain sense, be called *sacred* books, from the legendary stories, and spurious apocryphal writings, which, even then, certain superstitions or even heretical persons were endeavouring to palm off as genuine productions of the apostles or other inspired men. In contradistinction to these *spurious* forgeries (which were sometimes also called *apocryphal* books, because their authors and their origin were alike unknown)* the Church writers occasionally applied, as we have said, the terms "Scripture," "sacred Scripture" to what we now exclusively call the apocryphal books, to denote that they were *genuine* works, valued by the Church for the useful lessons which they contain, and, on that account, read in her public services. For this reason they were sometimes also designated *ecclesiastical* books. We may add, that another very probable reason why the term "Scripture" was so often extended to the apocryphal books in ancient times is this, that these books were bound up in the *same volume* with the inspired books, and so were naturally called by the same name.† However, that the writers who thus extend the term "Scripture," &c., to the apocryphal books had no intention whatever to *canonize* them (in our sense of the word) is clear from this, that those very same writers elsewhere apply the terms "Scripture," "divine Scripture," "Revelation," "holy inspirations," and the like, not only to those apocryphal books which the Church of Rome rejects equally with us, namely, the third Book of Esdras, and the fourth Book of Maccabees, but even to the Prophecy of Enoch and the Shepherd of Hermas.‡ So that it is plain the terms in question were employed in a wide and loose sense, and that any argument founded upon such patristic usage by the advocates of the Tridentine decree would be useless, because it would prove too much. In further illustration of this patristic usage, we may observe, that in the English books of Homilies, the authors of which were certainly very far from recognising the divine authority of the Apocrypha, the apocryphal Book of Wisdom is several times quoted as Scripture, and even as holy Scripture.§ Nay, more, we find the highest Roman Catholic authorities themselves using the terms "Scripture," "divine Scripture,"

* It is very necessary to bear this fact in mind, in order to avoid confusion: what we term apocryphal books the ancients frequently call *ecclesiastical*, and what they sometimes call apocryphal we should term spurious forgeries.

† The Apocryphal books and portions of books, which were all either originally composed in Greek or very soon translated into it, were incorporated with the Septuagint version of the Old Testament not long after the time of our Lord and his apostles; from the LXX. they were transferred into the Latin translations of the Old Testament, which before the time of Jerome, were all made immediately from the LXX.

‡ Thus Clemens Alexandrinus and Theodoret quote the third Book of Esdras; so does Athanasius, who yet, in his catalogue of the inspired books, excludes the Apocrypha. Ambrose quotes the fourth Book of Maccabees. Irenaeus and Tertullian quote the Prophecy of Enoch; and Origen quotes the Shepherd of Hermas.

§ The first book of Homilies is generally thought to have been composed by Crammer, Ridley, and Latimer; the bare mention of whose names is a sufficient evidence of their opinions respecting canonical Scripture. The second book was published simultaneously with the Thirty-nine Articles in 1562, in which revised edition of the original Articles an addition was made to the article concerning Holy Scripture, the object of this addition being to draw a distinct line of demarcation between the canonical books and the Apocrypha, and to declare that the latter were not to be applied to establish any doctrine.

ture," &c., in the same wide sense, as distinguished from merely secular writings. Thus Pope Nicholas I. speaks of "the divinely-inspired opinions of the Fathers": Pope Innocent III. quotes a passage of Augustine as "sacred Scripture," which expression Melchior Canus tells us is to be understood in the same sense as when the Papal laws are called "sacred"—viz., in order that they may be distinguished from the laws of temporal princes: and Bellarmine says, that "although the canons of councils and the decrees of popes are distinguished from and inferior to divine Scripture, yet that, *in their own way* (*suo modo*), they are, and may be called, *sacred and canonical Scripture*, in order to distinguish them from the writings of profane authors and of the Church Fathers, which are not a rule."—De concil. auct., lib. ii., c. xii.

Having premised thus much respecting the usage which prevailed in ancient times relatively to the terms "canonical," "Scripture," &c., we proceed to examine the documents above enumerated, and which are those whereon Roman Catholic divines found their defence of that part of the decree of the 4th session of the Council of Trent which concerns the Apocrypha. First, then, we take the famous passage of Augustine, in his treatise "*de Doctrina Christiana*" (lib. ii., cap. 8). Speaking of the study of writings connected with sacred subjects, which (in accordance with the usage above noticed) he calls by the generic name of "divine Scriptures" (*divinae Scripturae*), he recommends that particular attention should be bestowed on the Scriptures called *canonical*. He then proceeds—"The following method is, therefore, to be observed in reference to the canonical Scriptures; those which are received by all the Catholic Churches are to be preferred to those which some of the Churches do not yet acknowledge; and in the case of the latter class, again, those which are received by the more numerous and more important Churches are to be preferred to those which are received by the fewer and less important." Having laid down this general principle, he then gives a catalogue of all the *canonical* Scriptures ("totus canon Scripturarum"). In this catalogue he includes Tobit, Judith, two Books of Maccabees, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus.* This catalogue has been termed the Canon of Augustine, in contradistinction to the Canon of Jerome (from which the Apocryphal books are excluded); and is the Canon which the Council of Trent has ratified, declaring all the books, with all their parts, to be sacred and canonical. The advocates of the Council appeal to the authority of Augustine in justification of the canonization of the Apocrypha; but the slightest attention to Augustine's words shows that he uses the word "canonical" in a very different sense from that in which the Tridentine Fathers employ it. With them "canonical" means "inspired;" he uses the term in a much wider sense, as denoting the books which were held in reverence and read in the Churches, in which category, besides the inspired books, the apocryphal were also contained. And that the word, as employed by him, must be understood with this latitude of meaning is obvious, from what he says as to the *preference* to be given to some of the canonical books over others. In the case of *inspired* Scripture, it would be absurd to talk of preference. Inspiration does not admit of degrees. The divine element of the Scriptures is not a quantitative thing, conferring different values on different parts of the Scriptures, in proportion to the amount of it that may be found or thought to exist in them. The above is no new explanation of Augustine's words in the passage under consideration; it was given by one of the most renowned Roman doctors, and one, moreover, who was the personal antagonist of Luther, Cardinal Cajetan. We shall quote his own words, as they occur at the close of his Commentary on the Book of Esther. The whole passage is most remarkable, and, therefore, we will make no apology for giving it at length:—"Here we end our commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament; for the remainder—viz., Judith, Tobit, and the Books of Maccabees—are not included by St. Jerome among the canonical books, but are placed, along with Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, among the Apocrypha. Do not be uneasy, tyro, if you should anywhere find those [apocryphal] books enumerated amongst the canonical, either by holy councils or by holy doctors; for the words both of councils and of doctors must be reduced to the judgment of Jerome; and, according to his decision, *those books* [the apocryphal books enumerated], and if there be any others like them in the canon of the Bible, are *not canonical*—that is to say, do not contain rules for confirming articles of faith; they may, however, be called canonical, as containing rules for the edification of the faithful, inasmuch as they have been admitted into the canon of the Bible and authorized for this very purpose. With this distinction you will be able to discern the meaning of the words of Augustine (*de Doctr. Christ.*, lib. ii.), as, also, of the decrees of the Council of Florence, under Eugenius IV., and of the provincial Councils of Carthage and Laodicea, and of Popes Innocent and Gelasius.[†] These striking

words were penned before the Council of Trent had uttered its anathemas against all who should dare to deny the canonical authority (in the *fullest* sense of the word canonical) of the apocryphal books. We learn from them—First, that a Roman cardinal (who is described by his contemporaries as an “incomparable theologian,” “to whom, as to a common oracle, men were wont to resort in all difficult questions of theology”), an avowed enemy of the Reformation, writing shortly before the Council of Trent, adopts Jerome’s canon, and rejects the Apocrypha as authority in questions of *faith*, while he allows its value for the *edification* of the faithful; thus assigning to it exactly the same place as the Church of England does in her 6th Article. Secondly we learn that, in the passage of Augustine under consideration, as also in the other documents referred to by Cajetan, the word “canonical,” when applied to the apocryphal books, is used in a wide sense, which must not be confounded with that which it bears when applied specially to the inspired books. Thirdly, we see from Cajetan’s own usage, that, even in his day, the phrase “*Canon* of the Bible” (*Canon Bibliae*) meant the whole list of books contained in the Vulgate, comprising the *non-canonical* as well as the strictly canonical Scriptures.

Bearing in mind, then, this usage of the word "canonical," we come to the palmary argument in support of the divine authority of the Apocrypha, derived from the decree of the Council of Carthage. We said we would consent to waive all the objections to the genuineness of this decree, weighty as they are, and admit its evidence in the case. Let us hear, then, what it is. In the 47th canon it is decreed, "that, with the exception of the canonical Scriptures, nothing should be read in the Church under the name of divine Scriptures" [i.e., no forgeries or legendary tales pretending to be the compositions of inspired men]. Then a catalogue is given of the "canonical Scriptures" ("sunt autem canonicas Scripturae," &c.), which agrees exactly with that given by Augustine, except that in it the authorship of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus is attributed to Solomon, which is a manifest error, and, of itself, invalidates the claim of the council, not only to be regarded as infallible (for this it can hardly claim, in any case, having been only a *provincial synod*), but even as competent to pronounce an opinion upon the subject. Without, however, insisting upon this, and allowing the decree all the weight that its advocates claim for it, our simple answer is, that the word "canonical" is used in the wide sense above explained—the sense in which Augustine, who is said to have been present at the council, himself employed it—the sense, moreover, in which Cajetan expressly tells us we must understand it. Nay, more, the decree itself explains the sense in which the word "canonical" is used in it; for at the close thereof we read, that the council declared the aforesaid books to be canonical, "because they received them from their ancestors "to be read in the Church" ("in Ecclesiis legenda"). And, lastly, that the African Church of the fourth century never intended to place the Apocrypha on a par with the inspired Scriptures—to *canonize* it, in the modern sense of the term—is clear from the explicit testimony of the two African bishops, Junilius and Primasius, who wrote about a century and a half later (the middle of the 8th century). Junilius expressly excludes from the canonical Scriptures (strictly so called) the books of Judith, Wisdom, and Maccabees; and, for this reason, because the Hebrews and Jerome excluded them—a reason, which, of course, excludes the rest of the Apocrypha also. And Primasius, commenting on the 4th chapter of the Apocalypse, says, that St John, in mentioning the twenty-four wings and twenty-four elders, alludes to the number of the books of the old Testament, "which number," he adds, "we have received as possessed of canonical authority." Surely, the African Church of the 6th century, speaking through two of its most eminent bishops, may be allowed to be a better expositor of the sense intended to be assigned to the word "canonical" by their great bishop, Augustine, and a council at which he assisted, only a century and a half before, than a few Italian bishops of the 16th century, who, as we shall hereafter see, were very far from being unanimous respecting the conclusion which was, at last, arrived at.

In our next number we hope to resume this subject, and complete our examination of the proofs usually urged in support of the Tridentine decree respecting the Apocrypha.

locantur, cum libro Sapientie et Ecclesiastico. Nec turberis, novitie si aliebri repereris libros istos inter canonicos suppeditari, vel in sacris conciliis, vel in sacris doctioribus. Nam ad Hieronymi libram redacturam tam verba conciliorum, quam doctiorum; et iuxta litium sententiam, libri isti, et si quilibet sicut in *Canone Biblicae* similares, non sunt canonici hoc non sunt regulares ad firmandum ea quae sunt fidei; possunt tamen dicti canonici, hoc enim regulares ad confirmationem fidem, ut potest in *Canone Biblio* ad hoc regulae ad authoritatem, Cum haec essim distinctiones discernere posita et dicta Augustini in lib. 2, de Doctr. Christ., et Scripta in Cenc. Flor., sub Eugen. IV., Scripta que in proximis viciibz Concilii Carthag. et Laodic, et ab Innocentio se Gelasio V. continet. Cuncta ergo, ut supra, esse canonica. Non

Pontificibus. Cajetan. In omnes authenticos Vet. Test. hist. libr., Comment. p. 482. Parisia, 1546.

* The Christian Fathers generally, and, amongst them, Jerome, not unfrequently arranged the Old Testament Books as received by the Jews (and, consequently, exclusive of the Apocrypha), so as to correspond in number to the letters of the Greek alphabet (24), just as the Jews made it books, in conformity with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

Correspondence.

THE TWO VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have been induced by your paper to compare some chapters of the Douay and English versions of the Holy Scriptures together, and am struck with their substantial agreement.* I wish, however, to know which translation (for they are both, of course, only translations) is really correct in the following passages. The Prophecy of *Isaiah*, ch. i., v. 18, Douay Bible, has—"Come and accuse me, saith the Lord." The English Bible translates the same words—"Come now, and let us *reason* together, saith the Lord."

I cannot but think this appeal to reason savours strongly of Protestantism, though I confess I cannot well make sense of the Douay translation; for why should "learning to do well, relieving the oppressed, or defending the fatherless and the widow," lead any one to accuse God; or why should accusing God make sins that are as red as scarlet, white as snow. The expression, to say the best of it, is not a happy or very intelligible one, though I doubt if your English version be a bit more so; for what has reason to do with the forgiving of sins, any more than accusing God could lead to such forgiveness.

I dare say I am only displaying my own ignorance by these remarks; but not pretending to be a learned scholar myself, I am really anxious to know from those who are learned in said matters, what they have to say on the subject. As to asking a (Roman) Catholic priest for such information, I have long since given that up as useless, or worse; for I should at once be marked as a heretic if I did so.

When my hand is in, I may as well ask you about another passage—Isaias, ch. ii.; after speaking, in the 18th and 19th verses, of the total destruction of idols, and man going into the holes of the rocks and caves of the earth from the face of the fear of the Lord, and the glory of His Majesty when he shall rise up to strike (or shake terribly) the earth, proceeds, according to the Douay Bible, in v. 20, thus—"In that day a man shall cast away his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which he made for himself to adore, moles and bats." Your authorized version has it—"In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver and gold which they made to worship, to the moles and to the bats." This may appear to be a trifling difference, but there must be some reason for it; both cannot be right. Can you tell me whether idols of silver and gold were ever made by any one in the shape of moles and bats. Did any nation ever worship moles and bats, or, rather, silver and gold images of them? I am sincerely anxious to come at the truth, and especially with reference to the note of the D^ouay version on v. 18 of that chapter—Your obedient servant,

AN INQUIRER.

The two questions put by our correspondent can be shortly answered. On the first point—namely, whether the translation of Isaiah i. 18, given in the Douay Bible, or the English authorized version, is the correct one, we have no hesitation in giving a preference to the latter, for the following reasons:—The particular form of the Hebrew verb which the Douay Bible translates “accuse,” and the authorized version “reason,” unquestionably means, “to argue a point, reason.” Thus, for example, Gesenius, the best modern Hebrew authority, states as the meaning, “disputavit cum aliquo,” to dispute with any one. The LXX version of this word, in the passage before us, is διδεξθαμεν, and the Syriac version reads both of which give the same interpretation as the authorized English translation. It may be added, that this form of the verb never has in Hebrew the active meaning “to accuse.” Our Roman Catholic readers can satisfy themselves on this point by referring to the other passages where it occurs—viz., Gen. xx. 16, and Job. xxiii. 7. Our correspondent appears to have found some difficulty in perceiving what reason has to do with the forgiveness of sins; but a moment’s consideration of the entire passage will, we think, remove this objection. The verse contains an invitation to discuss the question whether God was willing or unwilling to show mercy, implying that reason, as well as justice, was on his side, and asserting his power and his willingness to pardon the most aggravated sins. The implied conclusion of the reasoning is, that God’s willingness to pardon the Jews threw the blame of their destruction on themselves. The fulness and freeness of this offer of pardon arose from the fact, that God had himself provided a way, whereby, in the fulness of time, a full and sufficient atonement would be made for the sins of the whole world; a way whereby all mankind might “be justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.”—Rom. iii. 24.

The second question of our correspondent, with reference to the "moles and bats," may be disposed of more briefly. Here the Douay version appears plainly wrong; for the preposition "to" (in Hebrew ל), occurs before both the words moles and bats in the original. The Vulgate version (which the Douay translator, as usual, has ser-

* Augustine does not expressly mention the Book of Baruch or the apocryphal parts of Daniel and Esther, but it may be assumed that he intended to include them; because the African Bib' was a translation from the LXX., in which they form constituent parts of Jeremiah, Daniel, and Esther, respectively.

[†] Hoc in loco terminamus Commentaria Librorum Histor. Vet. Test. Nam reliqui—viz. Judith, Tobie, et Maccabiorum, libri a B. Hieronymo extra canonicas Abres supplicantur, et inter Apocrypha

* Both versions, for instance, of Isaiahs 1:13 are literally the same.
--"Incense is an abomination to me."

Income Tax